

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending and under consideration. In the non-final Office Action of October 13, 2006, the Examiner repeated the rejection of claims 1-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by *Mukaiyama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,631,407)* (“*Mukaiyama*”) in view of *Nishida (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,697)* (“*Nishida*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and address the Examiner’s disposition below.

Independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, 27, 28, 36, 37, 41, 41, 44, and 45 have each been amended to claim subject matter relating to receiving a user command to execute the service application; determining whether the service application includes the first component and the second component; and when it is determined that the service application includes the first component and the second component, initiating execution of the first and second components at their respective locations.

Claims 46-48 have been canceled.

Applicants’ independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, 27, 28, 36, 37, 41, 41, 44, and 45 each claim subject matter relating to receiving a user command to execute a service application. The service application has a first component on a client and a second component on a server. It is determined whether the service application includes the first component and the second component. When it is determined that the service application includes both first and second components, the first component is executed on the client and the second component is executed on the server. When the second component has terminated execution, the server sends a completion indicator to the client to indicate that the second component has terminated execution. The first component is automatically terminated responsive to receipt of the completion indicator.

This is clearly unlike *Mukaiyama* in view of *Nishida*. To begin with, *Mukaiyama* in view of *Nishida* fails to disclose or suggest determining whether a service application includes a first component and a second component; and when it is determined that the service application includes the first component and the second component, initiating execution of the first and second components at their respective locations. *Mukaiyama* and *Nishida* each fails to disclose or suggest determining whether a service application includes a first component at a client and a second component at a server. This subject matter is simply not discussed in *Mukaiyama* and *Nishida*.

For at least this reason, *Mukaiyama* in view of *Nishida* fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, 27, 28, 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, and 45.

Claims 2-9, 11-17, 20-26, 29-35, 38-39, and 42-43 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, or 41 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, or 41 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-45 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Rauch/ (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P. O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
Telephone (312) 876 8000
Customer No. 58328